

pg 4



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/831,845	04/01/1997	BARTLEY H. CALDER	P2167/SUN1P1	9132

22434 7590 11/20/2003
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

34

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRE

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/831,845

Applicant(s)

CALDER ET AL.

Examiner

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/11/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GOSLING (EP 718761 A1) in view of PASHUPATHY (US 6,078,951).

As to claim 1, GOSLING teaches a computer-implemented framework for associating data (object) with a command object (viewer) wherein the data is associated with an application (user interface control program / user's web access program), the computer-implemented framework comprising: a data handler mechanism (class loader / inter-computer link control program); a data retriever mechanism (objects directory / disc directory or catalog / objects); and a mapping mechanism (viewer library) (pg. 2, lines 37-44; pg. 4, lines 11-22, pg. 5, lines 24-35; pg. 5, lines 49-58; pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 7, lines 8-9; pg. 24; lines 6-24). However, GOSLING does not explicitly mention that the data handler mechanism allows use of new command objects without modifying the application. GOSLING does teach that invention allows object viewers unknown, herein new to the user's web access program to be dynamically used and added to the system in a viewer library for the user (pg. 2, line 37 – pg. 3, line 11). It would be inherent that this dynamic loading does not modifying the users web access program since the viewer library is changed by the addition of the new viewer and not the web access program. However, GOSLING does not teach returning the command list for display.

PASHUPATHY teaches a mapping mechanism (server container) being arranged to obtain a command list (list of viewers for the file type) for the application to display (user has to select appropriate viewer if plural viewers are capable of accessing the file), the command list (list of viewers for the file type) including the command object (user-selected viewer) obtained, wherein the command object is executed by the application upon selection of the command object from the command list (col. 6, lines 62 – col. 7, line 4). It is inherent that the viewers returned are displayed in a list since the user must select the appropriate viewer to use to view the data. It is also obvious based on the combination of GOSLING in view of PASHUPATHY that the command list is returned to the data handler mechanism (class loader) then the application (user's web access program) for displaying the command list in order to receive the subsequent selection by the user. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of GOSLING with the teachings of PASHUPATHY in order to automate the searching, installation, configuration, and updating of software for a computer system (col. 1, line 58-60).

As to claim 2, GOSLING teaches the downloading of data and binding such data to a command object (pg. 6, lines 15-28). It would be obvious that since the handle is initially received prior to the body that the data is a stream of bytes over the network.

As to claim 3, GOSLING teaches that the two computer systems have different computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be

obvious that that there would have to exist a mechanism for converting the data from one format understandable by one platform to another in order for data to be processed and interpreted for viewing.

As to claim 4, GOSLING teaches the server computer system is a Sun Microsystems computer (pg. 4, line 25). It would be obvious that since the data object and the command object are retrieved from the server computer system and since it is well known in the art that a Sun system is formulated in Java that the data object and command object are created in the Java programming language.

As to claim 5, GOSLING teaches the data is text data (pg. 5, lines 28-35).

As to claim 6, GOSLING teaches the data handler is arranged to receive a request from the application, to bind the data to the command object, and to return the command object to the application (pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 7, lines 8-9).

As to claim 7, GOSLING teaches that the two computer systems have different computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be obvious that that there would have to exist a mechanism for converting the data from one format understandable by one platform to another in order for data to be processed and interpreted for viewing.

As to claim 8, GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism includes a look-up table (listing) arranged to associate the command object with the data (pg. 6, lines 22-28).

As to claim 9, GOSLING teaches a computer implemented method for associating data (object) with a command object (viewer) in response to a request from an application (user interface control program / user's web access program), the method comprising: accessing the data through an interface (class loader / inter-computer link control program) in response to the request from the application; accessing a mapping mechanism (viewer library) which is independent of the interface but in communication with the interface to locate an installed command object (viewer known to user) that is appropriate for the data; obtaining the command object; binding the command object to the data; and returning the command object to the application to allow execution of the command object (viewer allows object to be accessible to user) (pg. 2, lines 37-44; pg. 4, lines 11-22, pg. 5, lines 24-35; pg. 5, lines 49-58; pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 7, lines 8-9; pg. 24; lines 6-24). However, GOSLING does not explicitly mention that the interface allows use of new command objects without modifying the application. GOSLING does teach that invention allows object viewers unknown, herein new to the user's web access program to be dynamically used and added to the system in a viewer library for the user (pg. 2, line 37 – pg. 3, line 11). It would be inherent that this dynamic loading does not modifying the users web access program since the

viewer library is changed by the addition of the new viewer and not the web access program. However, GOSLING does not teach returning the command list for display.

PASHUPATHY teaches obtaining a command list identifying commands (names of viewers) associated with the data (file type found) and wherein the command list (names of viewers) is returned for display (col. 6, lines 62 – col. 7, line 4).). It is inherent that the viewers returned are displayed in a list since the user must select the appropriate viewer to use to view the data. It is also obvious based on the combination of GOSLING in view of PASHUPATHY that the command list is returned to the data handler mechanism (class loader) then the application (user's web access program) for displaying the command list in order to receive the subsequent selection by the user. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of GOSLING with the teachings of PASHUPATHY in order to automate the searching, installation, configuration, and updating of software for a computer system (col. 1, line 58-60).

As to claim 10, GOSLING teaches that the two computer systems have different computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be obvious that that there would have to exist a mechanism for converting the data from one format understandable by one platform to another in order for data to be processed and interpreted for viewing.

As to claim 11, GOSLING teaches the server computer system is a Sun Microsystems computer (pg. 4, line 25). It would be obvious that since the data object

and the command object are retrieved from the server computer system and since it is well known in the art that a Sun system is formulated in Java that the data object and command object are created in the Java programming language.

As to claim 12, GOSLING teaches the downloading of data and binding such data to a command object (pg. 6, lines 15-28). It would be obvious that since the handle is initially received prior to the body that the data is a stream of bytes over the network.

As to claim 13, GOSLING teaches operating on the data using the command object (viewing the object) (pg. 7, lines 8-9).

As to claim 14, GOSLING teaches the command object is selected from a set of command objects associated with a command list (listing within the viewer library) and accessing the command list through the interface (pg. 6, lines 22-28).

As to claim 15, PASHUPATHY receiving a request for a command list from the application (check to see if viewer is most current version) obtaining the command list (names of viewers) associated with a type of data (file type found) and wherein the command list (names of viewers) is returned for display (col. 6, lines 62 – col. 7, line 4). It is inherent that the viewers returned are displayed in a list. It is also obvious based on the combination of GOSLING in view of PASHUPATHY that the command list is

returned to the interface (class loader / inter-computer link control program) that performs the cited steps and then the application (user's web access program) for display and subsequent selection by the user. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of GOSLING with the teachings of PASHUPATHY in order to automate the searching, installation, configuration, and updating of software for a computer system (col. 1, line 58-60).

As to claims 16-20, reference is made to a computer program product which corresponds to the method of claims 9-11, 13, and 14 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 9-11, 13, and 14 above. Claim 16 also details the mapping mechanism is not a part of the application. GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism is not part of the application (figures 2 & 3, viewer library is on server also).

As to claim 21, GOSLING teaches the command object (viewer) is obtained by the mapping mechanism (viewer library) based substantially on the data (handle) without an external input from a user of the application (pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 3, lines 1-9).

As to claim 22, GOSLING teaches the command object (viewer) is obtained by the mapping mechanism (viewer library) based substantially on the data (handle) without directly involving the application (pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 3, lines 1-9).

As to claim 23, refer to claim 1 for rejection. However, claim 23 further details the data handler mechanism is independent and interfacing with a plurality of applications. GOSLING teaches the client system may be a variety of different computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 27-28). Multitasking operating systems having a executing a plurality of applications are well known in the art and therefore would be obvious in view of the teachings of GOSLING.

As to claim 25, GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism (viewer library) is not a component of the data handler mechanism (class loader / inter-computer link control program) (fig 3).

As to claims 24 and 26, GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism (viewer library) and the data handler mechanism (class loader / inter-computer link control program) are separately maintained (fig 3).

As to claim 27, GOSLING teaches that the client system and the server system are two different computer platforms (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be obvious then that the application and class loader are the specific to one another since they are on the same system while the viewer library is not specific to the application since it is on a different system.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/11/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the references teach the data handler mechanism allowing for the use of new command objects without modifying the application. The examiner disagrees. Although, neither of the combination of Gosling and Pashupathy used explicitly language that new command objects are used without modifying the application, the teachings of Gosling and Pasupathy inherently teach this limitation. Gosling and Pasupathy each teach that viewers (command objects) unknown to a client system are downloaded and accessible to an application in order to access data. Gosling teaches this at page 6, lines 29-57, wherein if the appropriate viewer (command object) is not located within the viewer library, indicating that the selected object is of a data type which is unfamiliar to the user workstation such that no viewer is stored to access it, the class loader executes a search for an appropriate viewer and downloads the viewer if it is found. In addition, since the user is accessing the system through a web access program (pg. 2, line 36-44) and the viewer is found and downloaded to enable access to the data, the downloaded command object is otherwise new to the web access program. Pasupathy also teaches that if a viewer that supports the file type is not found, the client computer system interfaces with a server computer system, the names of viewers that support the file type is provided to the client computer system, the user of the client computer system is prompted to select one of the viewers provided, and the client computer system downloads the selected viewer to enable access to a selected file (col. 6, line 49 – col. 7, line 25). Therefore, the viewer

downloaded is initially unknown and subsequently new to the client system when it is found and loaded for the user to access the file. In addition, since browser applications allow users to interface with the Internet in order to display files that are in many different formats by using viewers (col. 1, line 16-57) and the client computer system downloads the appropriate viewer when it is unknown making the viewer subsequently new to the client, that the viewer is new to the browser which allows the user to access the remote data. Therefore, as indicated in the rejection the combination teach a generic interface (class loader) which allows for the use of new command objects (viewers unknown to the browser but subsequently founded and downloaded). The claim then states that this use is performed without modifying the application. In the recitations listed above for both reference, modification (addition) for a new command object, i.e. viewer, is only done to the client's list such that new viewer is added to a list that the application, i.e. browser, has access to and/or the operating system. There is no language in either prior art of record wherein the modification is made to the application. Therefore, the prior art of record allows for the use of new command objects without modifying the application. It is noted in Applicant's specification wherein the invention enables an application to be "blind" to the process of binding data with an appropriate command object and thereby allows new types of data and therefore, new command objects, to be created for use with the application without requiring that the application be **modified to recognize** the new command objects (col. 7, lines 16-28). Applicant's specification states prior techniques that an application recognizes a command object was by a look-up table used by the application to associate data with

command objects wherein new command objects modify the list that the application use (col. 3, lines 5-10). The prior art techniques of Gosling and Pasupathy allow for the list to be modified when a new viewer is discovered, i.e. found, but the application is never modified. Therefore, the prior art techniques meet the claimed limitations as disclosed wherein the application itself is not directly modified, but does not meet Applicant's concept of **allowing the use of new command objects without modifying the application to recognize the new command objects wherein a list used by the application is not modified** as defined in the specification.

Applicant then argues that the combination does not teach or suggest a command map obtaining a command list, providing the command list to the application by using a data handler, and displaying the command list. The examiner disagrees. Gosling teaches a data handler (class loader) that receives commands (via hyperlinks) from an application (browser / users web access program) and downloads data (object) as well as an appropriate command object (viewer) to enable the application to access the command object and data (pg. 2, line 33-53; pg. 5, line 49 – pg. 6, line 9). Gosling also teaches that before viewers are downloaded, a determination is made whether or not to accept the object viewer. In order to perform the determination, the user is asked whether or not to accept the object viewer or a default decision to accept or not accept is initiated (pg. 6, lines 43-48). Pashupathy teaches a client computer system determines whether a command object (viewer) that supports a format or type of data (file) is locally known and if not retrieves the names of viewers that support the file type from a server computer system and provides those names to the user on the client

computer system for selection of one of the viewers wherein upon such selection the viewer is downloaded and installed to display the data (col. 6, line 35 – col. 7, line 25). Pashupathy makes no mention of what entity of the client computer system is performing the cited determination and obtaining. Therefore, based on the combination of Gosling with Pashupathy the class loader of the client computer system retrieves a list names of viewers that support the file type from a server computer system, i.e. command map, and provides those names to the user, via the browser (application) such that upon selection of a viewer the viewer is downloaded and installed to display the data. Hence, the combination of Gosling with Pashupathy teaches or suggest a command map (server computer system) obtaining a command list (list names of viewers), providing the command list (list names of viewers) to the application (browser / user web access program) by using a data handler (class loader), and displaying the command list (for selection of an appropriate viewer by the user). Therefore, the combination is adequately met by the claims as disclosed above.

Applicant then argues that the independent claims variably recite a command list including a command object for execution by an application. In responding the examiner would like to point out that Applicant's claimed execution of the command object is similar to Gosling's selection of a viewer and the execution of the selected viewer that enables the object or data to be accessible or displayed. Applicant then states that the techniques of the present invention recognize that many command objects should all be available to many different applications wherein in one example, "an application is arranged to utilize a set of command objects that are used by

numerous applications.” In responding, the examiner would like to point out that none of the claims disclose the command objects are usable by numerous applications. The closest claim to what Applicant is stating is claim 23, however, claim 23 as disclosed does not allude to this statement. Claim 23, details that the data handler mechanism is interfacing with a plurality of applications wherein a selected application has access to new command objects and that the mapping mechanism is associated with the plurality of applications. Hence, claim 23 broadly interpreted allows for one of a plurality of applications to access new command objects via a data handler mechanism and a mapping mechanism, wherein the other applications would never use command objects. Therefore, none of the claims specifically detail the command objects are usable by numerous applications. In addition, Gosling teaches that user node or client node may utilize different computer platforms and operating systems (col. 4, line 36-39; col. 4, lines 27-29). The examiner has stated that multitasking operating systems wherein a plurality of applications execute on an computer system is well known in the art and therefore would be obvious to one skilled in the art to have a multitasking operating system. The examiner has cited other prior art of record to show that a multitasking operating system that executes a plurality of programs is well known in the art. Gosling teaches a user access program. Therefore, it would be obvious that one of the programs is a user access program. It would also be obvious to one skilled in the art that the other applications are various other applications. Therefore, the examiner believes the limitation is broadly met and therefore, the claims are rejected as disclosed above.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Art Unit: 2126

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0286.

lab



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100